



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/783,726	02/14/2001	Mihal Lazaridis	555255012190	7167
7590	02/12/2004			EXAMINER EDELMAN, BRADLEY E
David B. Cochran, Esq. Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue 901 Lakeside Avenue, North Point Cleveland, OH 44114			ART UNIT 2153	PAPER NUMBER 30
DATE MAILED: 02/12/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Pfle

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/783,726	LAZARIDIS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Bradley Edelman	2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 70-85 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 70-85 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 February 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>25</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to Applicant's request for continued examination filed on January 12, 2004. Claims 70-85 are presented for further examination. Claims 45-55, 57, 60, and 62-69 have been canceled and claims 70-85 are new claims.

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the steps claimed must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. Claims 82, 84 and 85 objected to because of the following informalities:

In considering claim 82, the claim depends from itself (i.e. "The method of claim 82...") and is thus objected to. It clearly appears that the claim should have depended from claim 81, and it has thus been examined as such.

In considering claims 84 and 85, the numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not

be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Misnumbered claims 84 and 85 have been renumbered 83 and 84, respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 70-73, 77, and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AirMobile (Software for Lotus cc:Mail Wireless, Communication Client Guide, Motorola, 1995), in view of Bezaire et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,758,088, hereinafter “Bezaire”), and further in view of Eggleston et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,764,899, hereinafter “Eggleston”).

In considering claim 70, AirMobile discloses a method for forwarding electronic messages from a messaging server to a plurality of wireless mobile devices using a software program, comprising the steps of:

Receiving the electronic messages at a messaging server (“communication server”) and storing the electronic messages in a message store having a plurality of mailboxes, wherein each of the plurality of wireless mobile devices is associated with one of the plurality of mailboxes (p. 9, “Communication Server,” p. 10, “User Profile

Database," pp. 15-16, wherein mail is received and stored at the communication server, and the mail account is associated with a mobile device according the device ID); and

Without receiving requests to download the received electronic messages at the messaging server, continuously pushing the received electronic messages from the mailboxes associated with each of the wireless mobile devices to the wireless mobile devices to the wireless communication devices (p. 30, ¶ 5; p. 31, ¶ 1; "server push," "enables messages to be immediately downloaded when they are received"), wherein the continuously pushing step includes the steps of:

A. For each of the wireless mobile communication devices, the software program registering with a software interface associated with the messaging server to receive a notification signal when a new received electronic message is received and stored in an associated mailbox (pp. 10-11, 31, wherein the "software program" is the program containing the filters, and the "software interface" inherently interfaces between the filter program and the user's mailbox in order to forward the appropriate messages to the wireless device, such that "all filter changes made using your client software will be propagated to your registered account on your Motorola AirMobile Communication Server for cc:Mail");

B. Upon receipt of the notification signal for each of the new received electronic messages, the software program packaging the replicated new message into an electronic envelope, the envelope including addressing information associated with the wireless device (inherent in the step of forwarding messages from the messaging server to the wireless device);

C. Transmitting the electronic messages from the software program to a wireless gateway computer system (“wireless network adapter”) via a wired connection, the wireless gateway computer system coupling the wired network to the wireless network (Fig. 1.1 – “wireless network adapter”);

D. Receiving the electronic envelope at the wireless gateway and using the addressing information contained within the envelope in order to send the new message to the wireless mobile communication device via the wireless network (inherent in the process of sending the messages through the wireless gateway to the wireless network); and

E. Receiving the electronic envelope at the wireless mobile communications device, removing the electronic envelope from the new message, and storing the new message at the wireless device (p. 39, ¶ 1, wherein removing the envelope and storing the message is inherent in order to allow a user to view the message).

However, AirMobile does not disclose that either (1), the wireless gateway is connected to the messaging server through a TCP/IP wired network, or (2) the messages are stored on the messaging server and *replicated* before being forwarded to the wireless mail system. Nonetheless, both of these features are well known in the wired-to-wireless e-mail messaging art, as evidenced by Bezaire and Eggleston, respectively.

Regarding (1), AirMobile discloses using a *modem-type* wireless gateway device connected *directly* to the messaging server to couple the wired network to the wireless network. The claimed invention requires using a *TCP/IP-based* wireless gateway

device connected *through a TCP/IP wired connection* to the messaging server to couple the wired network to the wireless network. Nonetheless, the use of a TCP/IP wireless gateway interface, as opposed to a modem-type gateway interface, is well known for coupling a wired network to a wireless network in an e-mail system, as evidenced by Bezaire. In a similar art, Bezaire discloses an e-mail system for allowing users send e-mail messages from a wired network to a wireless network through a wireless gateway, wherein the wireless gateway is connected to an e-mail messaging server through a TCP/IP connection (Fig. 1; col. 3, lines 11-25, wherein "TCP/IP/SMTP is used as a network, transport, and messaging application protocols"). Given this knowledge, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of using a TCP/IP-based wireless gateway device to connect the wired and wireless networks in the system taught by AirMobile, to avoid the need for each messaging server to use its own wireless modem-type device, thereby decreasing the costs to the messaging service providers. Therefore, it would have been obvious to replace the modem-type gateway device in the AirMobile system with a TCP/IP-based device, as taught by Bezaire.

Regarding (2), AirMobile discloses forwarding messages received at the messaging server to the wireless device. However, AirMobile does not explicitly state that the messages are stored on the messaging server and *replicated* before being forwarded to the wireless mail system. Nonetheless, most LAN-based mail servers store messages in addition to forwarding the messages to a client, as is well known and as evidenced by Eggleston. In a similar art, Eggleston teaches a system for forwarding

messages from a LAN-based host through a wireless host to a mobile client device, wherein the LAN-based host stores messages, thereby maintaining a replica of the messages, before forwarding them to the client (col. 4, lines 44-51; col. 12, lines 32-39, wherein the messages are copied and maintained at a host system, although they are not replicated an additional time at the “communication server”). Thus, given the teaching of Eggleston, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of replicating the messages at the messaging server taught by AirMobile, to preserve received messages in case the client memory fails or the message is lost in transmission. Therefore, it would have been obvious to include the mail replication feature taught by Eggleston in the mail forwarding system taught by AirMobile and Bezaire.

In considering claim 71, Eggleston further discloses that messages sent between the wired and wireless systems can be compressed (col. 11, lines 63-67). Given this knowledge, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to compress the messages in the system taught by AirMobile, Bezaire, and Eggleston, prior to transmission to the gateway, and to decompress the messages at the mobile device, as suggested by Eggleston, in order to increase available bandwidth and to provide faster and less expensive communications (see Eggleston, col. 12, lines 7-9).

In considering claim 72, AirMobile further discloses storing a plurality of user profiles for each of the wireless mobile devices for use by the software program, the

profiles including a filter list for blocking certain electronic messages from being replicated and transmitted to the wireless mobile device (p. 10, "User Profile Database," "Filtering").

In considering claim 73, AirMobile further discloses transmitting a command message from the wireless devices to the server software program, wherein the command message adds an electronic message sender to the filter list so that messages from the sender are blocked from being forwarded to the wireless device (p. 10, ¶ 6; p. 11, ¶ 1; see also, pp. 40-41).

In considering claim 77, AirMobile further discloses a plurality of desktop computer systems in communication with the messaging server (Fig. 1-1, "cc:Mail Client"), and further teaches controlling the operation and configuration of the software program using one of the desktop systems (the "cc:Mail Client" will be able to control the operation of the mail box).

In considering claim 81, AirMobile further discloses transmitting a plurality of triggering commands to the software program, each command being associated with one of the plurality of wireless mobile devices and initiating the software program to continuously push the received electronic messages from the mailbox associated with the wireless mobile device to the wireless mobile device (p. 32, "Launching Motorola,"

wherein the continuous pushing for each mobile device is activated when the cc:Mail Mobile is launched at the device).

4. Claim 74 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AirMobile, Bezaire, and Eggleston, in view of MobileVision (Mobile Vision User Manual, CE Software, Inc., 1995).

In considering claim 74, AirMobile discloses allowing only certain attachments to be received at the mobile device, according to user selection (p. 10, ¶ 5). However, AirMobile does not explicitly disclose determining whether an attachment is of the type that can be received and displayed at a particular mobile device, and if so, then replicating and transmitting the attachment from the software program to the wireless mobile device. Nonetheless, this forwarding feature is well known, as evidenced by MobileVision. In a similar art, MobileVision discloses an e-mail system for forwarding messages from a wired server to a wireless computing device, wherein the system determines whether an attachment is of the type that can be received and displayed at a particular mobile device, and if so, then transmits the attachment from the software program to the wireless mobile device (MV, p. 4-32 - "Enclosure" rules). A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of including such attachment processing steps in the system taught by AirMobile and Eggleston, so that important attachments that could be processed at the mobile device would be sent immediately, while attachments that could not be processed by the device are maintained at the server, thereby preserving network

bandwidth. Thus it would have been obvious to include this attachment feature in the system taught by AirMobile, Bezaire, and Eggleston.

Furthermore, as discussed with regard to claim 70, the feature of replicating forwarded messages is well known, as taught by Eggleston. Therefore, it would have been obvious to both replicate and forward the attachments in the combined system taught by AirMobile, Bezaire, Eggleston, and MobileVision, to preserve received attachments in case the client memory fails or the attachment is lost in transmission.

5. Claims 75-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AirMobile, in view of Bezaire and Eggleston, and further in view of Ross Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 5,812,671, hereinafter "Ross").

In considering claim 75, the system taught by AirMobile, Bezaire, and Eggleston fails to explicitly disclose the use of encryption keys for sending the messages. Nonetheless, storing an encryption key at a server for each of a plurality of destination devices, and using the key to encrypt detected messages before forwarding them to a destination device is well known, as evidenced by Ross (col. 3, lines 8-23). Given the teaching of Ross, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of encrypting the messages sent in the system taught by AirMobile, Bezaire, and Eggleston, to increase the security of the system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to include the encryption steps disclosed by Ross in the system taught by AirMobile, Bezaire, and Eggleston.

In considering claim 76, AirMobile further discloses generating electronic messages at the mobile device, sending them through the gateway to the server, and transmitting the messages from the mailboxes to message recipients, wherein the messages are addressed using the user's e-mail address ("cc:Mail" address, p. 38, "Sending/Transmitting e-mail messages"). Furthermore, as discussed previously, the combined system of AirMobile, Bezaire, and Eggleston discloses connecting the messaging server with the wireless gateway via a TCP/IP connection.

However, the combined system taught by AirMobile, Bezaire, and Eggleston does not disclose storing the reply messages at the server. Nonetheless, Examiner takes official notice that storing, at an e-mail server, replies and other messages generated at a personal computing device, is well known in the art. E-mail programs such as Microsoft Exchange, Yahoo Mail, and others, include a function for storing sent messages at the e-mail server. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to store the sent messages at the server in the system taught by AirMobile, Bezaire, and Eggleston, in case a user wanted to review the previously sent messages.

In addition, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include the reverse encryption steps as the steps taught by Ross, in the system taught by AirMobile, Bezaire, and Eggleston, to allow secure message transmission in both directions across the network, thus increasing security of the system.

6. Claims 78, 82, and 83 (erroneously labeled “84” by Applicant) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AirMobile in view of Bezaire and Eggleston, and further in view of Dunker et al. (CE Software Announces MobileVision, CE Software, Inc., 1995, hereinafter “Dunker”).

In considering claim 78, AirMobile fails to explicitly disclose that the desktop system can specifically control whether steps (A) – (C) are enabled. Nonetheless, allowing a desktop computer to control whether wireless message forwarding functions at a server are enabled is well known, as evidenced by Dunker. In a similar art, Dunker discloses a system for integrating a LAN-based mail system with a wireless pager, wherein message filtering and forwarding can be controlled from either the wireless device or desktop computers on the LAN (p. 1, ¶ 5, “MobileVision rules can be modified either at the office or from the road”). Given the teaching of Dunker, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of allowing a user at a desktop to control enablement of the forwarding steps, in order to save battery power at the mobile device when a user is present at home or at the office. Therefore, it would have been obvious to allow a user to control the forwarding steps disclosed by AirMobile, Bezaire, and Eggleston, from a desktop, as taught by Dunker.

In considering claim 82, claim 82 presents a similar function as claim 78 (triggering commands for continuous pushing are generated at desktop computer systems coupled to the software program via a LAN). Thus, claim 82 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 78.

In considering claim 83, AirMobile further discloses that the triggering commands are generated at the wireless devices (p. 11, ¶ 1).

7. Claim 79 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AirMobile, Bezaire, and Eggleston, in view of Microsoft Outlook 97 (Padwick et al., Que Corporation, 1997, hereinafter “Padwick”).

In considering claim 79, although the combined teaching of AirMobile, Eggleston, and Dunker discloses substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose performing the same forwarding steps described in claim 70 for calendar information. Nonetheless, Padwick discloses the use of Microsoft Outlook, which includes messaging functions for calendar information, as evidenced by Padwick. Padwick discloses the Microsoft Outlook 97 system, which stores calendar data for a user at a message store associated with the user, detects changes in calendar data at the message store (i.e. meeting requests), and then addresses and transmits the changes to the user computer (pp. 360-363). Given the teaching of Padwick, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of replacing the cc:Mail system taught by AirMobile with the Microsoft Outlook 97 System taught by Padwick, thereby including storage and transmission of meeting requests, to increase the functionality of the mobile device, and to make the device compatible with the widely used Microsoft Outlook system (see also, Isomursu et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,400,958, col. 8; Deo et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,356,956, cols. 3-4; both describing pager

devices that can receive calendar messages from a host computer). Therefore, it would have been obvious to use the Microsoft Outlook 97 system taught by Padwick, in the combined message forwarding system taught by AirMobile, Bezaire, and Eggleston.

8. Claim 80 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AirMobile, Bezaire, and Eggleston, further in view of either Adler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,630, hereinafter "Adler") or alternatively Zerber (U.S. Patent No. 5,951,636).

In considering claim 80, although the combined teaching of AirMobile and Eggleston discloses substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose the claimed steps of retrieving different replicated portions of the messages at different times according to a user selection. Nonetheless, retrieving a first portion of a message at the destination, transmitting a request from the destination to retrieve a second portion of the message, and then sending that second portion from the messaging server is well known in the art, as evidenced by both Zerber and Adler. In a similar art, Zerber discloses downloading a first portion of a message ("header") at a client, then transmitting a command to a server to download additional content of the message, and finally transmitting that second portion to the client in response (claim 1, steps (c), (g), and (h)). Similarly, Adler discloses a system for forwarding messages to a wireless device, wherein the user can select for a first portion of a message to be received first, and can then subsequently request additional portions of the messages to be sent (col. 5, lines 3-9). Thus, given the teaching of either Zerber or Adler, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of

using the message retrieval function taught by Zerber or Adler in the system taught by AirMobile, Bezaire, and Eggleston, to minimize transfer time, and to consume minimal resources at the wireless device (see Zerber, col. 2, lines 24-30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to use the message retrieval system taught by either Zerber or Adler in the system taught by AirMobile, Bezaire, and Eggleston.

Furthermore, as discussed with regard to claim 70, the feature of replicating forwarded messages is well known, as taught by Eggleston. Therefore, it would have been obvious to both replicate and forward the message portions, as claimed, in the combined system taught by AirMobile, Bezaire, Eggleston, and Adler or Zerber, to preserve received message portions in case the client memory fails or the portions are lost in transmission.

9. Claim 84 (erroneously labeled "85" by Applicant) is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AirMobile, Bezaire, and Eggleston, in view of Applicant's admission of prior art.

In considering claim 84, claim 84 includes the limitation that the wireless mobile devices transmit a confirmation signal to the software program to indicate that the messages have been received at the devices. This feature is well known, as evidenced by Applicant's admission of the prior art ("Background of the Invention," p. 1, line 25 – p. 2, line 2 of the specification, "Wireless mobile data communications devices, especially those that can return a confirmation signal to the host that the pushed data has been received, are especially well suited for this type of push paradigm."). Thus, it would

have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to send a confirmation message to the server in the system taught by AirMobile, Bezaire, and Eggleston, so that the server can re-send any messages that fail to reach their destination.

Response to Arguments

In considering Applicant's remarks filed on January 12, 2004, the following factual arguments are noted:

- a. AirMobile does not teach continuously pushing the received electronic messages from the mailboxes associated with the mobile devices to the mobile devices, as claimed in claim 70.
- b. The AirMobile server is directly connected to a wireless modem, and therefore does not connect to the wireless gateway through a TCP/IP connection, as claimed in claim 70.

In considering (a), Applicant contends that AirMobile does not teach continuously pushing the received electronic messages from the mailboxes associated with the mobile devices to the mobile devices, as claimed in claim 70. Examiner respectfully disagrees. AirMobile states, “AirMobile for cc:Mail software implements *both* the traditional e-mail ‘client poll’ *and the more efficient ‘server push’* models of message delivery.” (emphasis added) See p. 30, last paragraph. AirMobile additionally states, “With Motorola AirMobile, messages are ‘pushed’ out to your portable PC from the server over the wireless network: you do not have to constantly call in to check for

messages. This implementation of 'server push' eliminates unnecessary communication between the client and server, minimizing communication costs and artificial delays." See p. 31, ¶ 1. Finally, "When a message arrives for you in your LAN-based cc:Mail Inbox, Motorola AirMobile software will immediately download the message to your laptop, assuming it passes your download filters, placing it in your cc:Mail Mobile Inbox." See p. 31, ¶ 3. From these passages, it is clear that AirMobile teaches a system for continuously pushing received electronic messages from the receiving mailbox to the user's mobile device.

As an additional note, see "Nomadic Tenets – A User's Perspective" (Gadol et al., Sun Microsystems Laboratories, June 1994), which describes the use of e-mail paging "push" systems as far back as June 1994 (p. 12, ¶ 1-2, "Paging works well for applications such as e-mail. It's preferable to receive an e-mail message when it's sent rather than have to go to the infrastructure (a post office to pick it up)."). Thus the feature of continuously pushing received e-mail messages to a wireless device is well known and does not render the claimed invention patentable over the prior art.

In considering (b), Applicant contends that the AirMobile server is directly connected to a wireless modem, and therefore does not connect to the wireless gateway through a TCP/IP connection, as claimed in claim 70. Examiner agrees, and has applied new art in rejecting the claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley Edelman whose telephone number is (703) 306-3041. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

For all After Final papers: (703) 746-7238.

For all other correspondences: (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Bradley Edelman

BE

February 9, 2004